**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Highline**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| * Compare above questions for 08-09, 09-10 and 10-11. * Disaggregate definitely by ethnicity, age, prof/tech vs. transfer. * Peer college comparisons; data should be asterisked to identify differences in comparison group colleges. * Data discussion for retreat: Opportunities for participants to influence the agenda for things that are relevant for them. | * The one goal is getting to college level, and shortening that time to get there. * Measuring course completion quarterly by instructor and providing/discussing that feedback. Already showing success, especially in 81. * Measuring persistence, college attainment within a year, time-to quantitative reasoning course. * Success in college-level courses. | **For internal department use:**   * Focus groups, satisfaction surveys and observations to determine if learning is active and relevance to students is being emphasized. * Making sure new approach is being implemented with fidelity. |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Northwest Indian College**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| Need to develop roughly comparable data elements from own internal data system | Not clear | * Director of institutional research currently vacant position. * Achieving the Dream means disparate projects and data should be pulled together at the institutional level which may aid evaluation of progress. |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Clark College**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| Clark changed its SAI recording so it now shows grade qualifiers. For this work, 9-10 needs to be compared with 10-11. If those were recorded the same, Clark can use the state data. If it changed, they will need to use local data to be sure they’re measuring 2.0 or better students. | Analyze students by entry level and looks at historical data, quarter to quarter (e.g. spring to spring) for 2004-07.  Will evaluate based on entry level what percentage pass as they go through the levels, what percentage complete level four and what percentage make it through college level quantitative reasoning course. Also track:   * Student entry level, * Number of attempts at each level, * Number of successful attempts at each level, * Number of quarters spent at each level, including quarters not taking math, * An ‘ever took ABE/GED math’ indicator, * Number of quarters between enrolling in college and enrolling in math, * An indicator for ‘took math during their first quarter’, * Quant point indicator.   Working on a student attribute survey measuring self-efficacy or resiliency; tried one round that didn’t give them the information they needed and are now working with their institutional effectiveness office to develop a better survey. Also mentioned contacting Cal Crow at CLC about this. | * Clark has three units teaching pre-college math: math, dev ed, and ABE. All three units are represented on the RPM team. * Clark has an option to stretch algebra out over three terms. * Clark starts more people in level 1 than other colleges (40% vs. 16%), but has a high level continuation from level 1 through to level 4 (44% vs. 32%). * RPM is building a set of core concept tests and quizzes to imbed in class. May not be in place before end of grant. * Focusing on consistency across classes, core content outcomes. Perhaps common testing in the future. |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**North Seattle**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| Since the major changes are still pilots, it may not make enough movement to track year over year changes. It makes more sense to track the pilot section against other sections that term and also see how well students from the pilots do in subsequent classes compared to students who did not take pilots. The math department is going to do this tracking on their own but it may be time prohibitive once the grant is over. | Excellent, detailed records of all pre-college math starts for the whole district, tracking the students through the levels to see where each falls off, all the way through college math to degree completion. (Note, this does not track repeaters.)  Also have a pivot table with two year tracking of starts and passes for developmental math sequence, broken down by ethnic background, financial aid, full-time part-time. | * The pilots link 81 with two credits of college-readiness instruction, 84 and 85 with supplemental math content, and 98 (‘hard linked’) with environmental science. * Also developing contextual, real life materials to share with department. * Developed common final exam questions for 84 and 85. Students test again on those same questions the first week of the subsequent class to see how much they retained. They would like to see if students in the pilots retain more. |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Everett**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| * Quant point by second year. * Completion rates by level, tracking ‘re-enrollment’ by measuring where students drop off. If they start in level 1, how many make it to 2, 3, 4, QP? * Analyze how fast students move from first pre-college class to quant point. * Quarter start (where are students in their college pathway when they take their first pre-college math…college level credits accumulated) is not as useful. | Measuring locally:   * Pass rates (passes/fails/ withdrawals/incompletes) by class for fall 09 and 10. Identifying courses and sections with high withdrawal rates; analysis so far shows particular courses (70 and 90) have much lower pass rates than other courses. * Evaluating two new ‘alternate’ classes that feed into 99 by seeing how those students fare in 99 compared to students coming through the traditional sequence. | Also of interest to track locally:  Student’s math placements compared to enrollment: how many people (and at which level) take placement exam but never enroll in that first class? |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Lower Columbia College**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| * Has tracked repeats in the past. When had Title 3 grant, tracked math to show where people dropped off. It’s time consuming, but could be done if useful. * Would like to compare in-class to math lab progress. | As Achieving the Dream college this year beginning to collect additional data relevant to RPM as well; more interested in how different demographic groups are doing.  LCC is comparing success rates between males and females and also with specific age groups (age groups for SAI don’t align with age groups for Achieving the Dream.)  Math department looks at annual program data, including fall to fall retention for biannual department assessment.  Math department is doing satisfaction surveys of students in revised classes to ask questions about topics like online textbook, awareness of tutoring, preferences. | * If there was a way to evaluate student attributes, that would be useful (would need support to develop a tool for that) * Changed placement test from Compass to MMT. * Changed series of four 5-credit classes to 3 5-credit classes   Next year will focus on making it faster:   * Courses will be modularized into 2 and 3 credit modules. Diagnostics will show which area students need. All one book. All one system. * Math department aligned with each other on common tests and processes. |

**RPM College Quantitative Data Analyses: Project-wide and Local Plans**

**Spokane Falls**

**Common Project Data from SAI (disaggregated by various student characteristics):**

1. What percentage of students earns a pre-college math point in the year they attempt pre-college math? (Note: not limited to fall cohort)
2. For students who start in the fall and begin math in level 1-3 that first year, what percentage makes substantive gain (two or more points) by the end of the year?
3. For students who start in the fall, and begin math in level 4 that first year, what percentage earns their quant point by the end of the year? (Note: The benefit here of using fall is you have one complete year.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Comments re Core Questions*** | ***Local Approaches*** | ***Other Notes*** |
| Spokane Falls SAI data includes IEL and another operation in Pullman that aren’t part of this project. In order for the above numbers to make sense, they need to be broken out, which needs to be done locally.  Want to measure student attributes, would like help developing survey that allows them to measure this at the beginning and end of class. They’ve talked to Mickey about this, but are interested in getting additional feedback.  Interested in whether people are able to transfer the skills (taught in a ‘multi-representational format’) focusing on interpretation and relationships to other classes, specifically science class.  Interested in core questions for 2008-09, 9-10, and 10-11. | College produces extensive annual report on math student outcomes (completed for 09-10, fall and winter quarters of 10-11—researcher left the college, but the full report should be completed for the 10-11 year); report   * evaluates student success by campus, faculty status, and mode * thoroughly covers placement testing and enrollment and class progression * shows success in subsequent math and science classes based on prerequisites.   (length of time from first pre-college to first college-level completion is an important measure)  Students need to get a 3.0 in last class before precalculus. If they don’t, they take a transition class. Research shows developmental math sequence doesn’t show negative outcomes in precalculus. | * Currently hiring a new IR person (or two). When that person comes on board Ann can work with them so they can produce #1,2 and 3 above locally. * RPM project has been implemented campus-wide; data collected on individual teachers show that early adopters have a higher retention rate. * A big issue at Spokane Falls that may affect data analysis is change in placement testing. Spring of 08-09 to spring of 09-10 college used MPT-G, which placed significantly more students in college-level and decreased enrollment in developmental education classes. In 10-11 placement switched back to MMT, a local instrument customized from Pearson. * Other projects overlap with RPM and are collecting data separately, e.g., Project Degree; students need to be developmental in 3 areas and have a low completion rate. * Previous curriculum focused on symbolic manipulation, algebra; now focusing on college-readiness standards, math and student attributes and multi-representational approach. |